REMARKS

By this amendment Applicant has amended the specification at pages 3 and 4, and has amended claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-17 and 19-20 for clarity. Claims 1-20 remain in the case.

The Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities.

Specifically the Examiner indicated that at page 4, lines 9 and 10 the A/D converter was mislabeled with the wrong drawing figure numeral. Applicant has corrected the first instance and deleted the second instance as being redundant. The Examiner also indicated that at page 11, line 32 "is complete" is in error. Applicant points out that "complete" is an adjective and not a verb, and therefore the phrase is correct as it stands. In view of the amendments to the specification the Examiner's objection is now deemed to be moot.

The Examiner objected to claims 9-14 since claim 9 does not define "SUT". Applicant has amended claim 9 accordingly to recite "a signal under test (SUT) to produce a sample stream" where the measurement window is located "at a plurality of positions within the sample stream." In view of the amendment to claim 9 the Examiner's objection to claims 9-14 is now deemed to be moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the phrases "the bits", "the mean value", "the intersymbol interference", "said ISI jitter" and "said DCD" all lack antecedent basis in various claims. Applicant has amended the claims to provide proper antecedent basis for all terms. Therefore claims 1-20 as amended are deemed to be allowable as being definite.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks allowance of claims 1-20 is urged since the Examiner indicated they contained allowable subject matter, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted, MARK L. GUENTHER

Thomas F. Lenihan

Reg. No. 32,152 Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC. Thomas F. Lenihan P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW) Beaverton, OR 97077 (503) 627-7266

Attorney's Docket No.: 7367-US1

March 9, 2007